

Application No. 10/687,503
Art Unit: 3721
Office Action dated: October 31, 2005

REMARKS

Claims 1, 10 and 22 have been amended to recite the "firing member" as the "firing bar", as per the Examiner's suggestion. Accordingly, no new matter is involved. Claims 1, 10 and 22 have been amended to recite the limitations of claims 2 and/or 11, and claims 2 and 11 have been cancelled herein. Accordingly, no new matter is involved.

In the previous office action, claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner stated:

"Claims 1, 10 and 22 recite the phrase "said firing bar" in lines 7, 8 and 11 of claim 1, lines 8-10 and 13 in claim 10, and lines 7.8.11.13 and 14 of claim 22. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claims. The remainder of the claims, excluding claims 8, 16 and 21, also recite the phrase "said firing bar", which is improper. Perhaps changing the phrase "a firing member" in line 5 of claim 1, line 6 of claim 10, and line 5 of claims 22 to read "a firing bar" would correct the problem."

As noted above Claims 1, 10 and 22 have been amended to recite the "firing member" as the "firing bar", as per the Examiner's suggestion. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejections to Applicants claims.

In the previous office action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 9, 10, 14, 20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Milliman et al. (USPN 6,669,073) in view of Geiste et al. (USPN 6,202,914). However, the Examiner also indicated that claims 2-8, 11-13, 15-19 and 21 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in the Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As noted above claims 1, 10 and 22 have been amended to recite the limitations of claims 2 and/or 11, and claims 2 and 11 have been cancelled herein. Therefore, Applicants submit that all pending claims are now fully allowable over the prior art cited by the

Application No. 10/687,503
Art Unit: 3721
Office Action dated: October 31, 2005

Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner re-examine and favorably reconsider Applicants' claims in the form of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Dean L. Garner /
Dean L. Garner, Esq.
Reg. No. 35,877
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Johnson & Johnson
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08933-7003
(513) 337-8559
Date: January 18, 2006

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.